Detailed Action

Remarks

1.   In response to the amendment filed January 13, 2008, claims 1-11 are presently pending

in application, of which claim 1 is presented in independent form.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

2.   An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or

additions be unaccepted to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1,312.

To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no longer later than the

payment of the issue fee.

3.   Authorization for this examiner's amendment for claims 1-2 and 4-5 was given in a

telephone interview with Danny Saban (Phone No. 9-728-658-5405 The applicant called from

Israel at 950 AM) (Inventor) August 4, 2008.

4.   The instant Examiner's amendment is directed to said entered amendment.

5.   Please amend the application as follows:

IN THE CLAIMS

Claim 1. (currently amended) A computer implemented method to create a structure from a

knowledge base of an organization, the knowledge base being part of a system comprising a

document database (DB) and queries submitted by users concerning the documents, wherein

the method performs definitive and decisive matching and grouping the queries into clusters

to enable analysis of the knowledge base of the organization; the method comprising: submitting by the users in the organization of queries having weighted characteristics; recording the details of the submitter comprising at least: job title; department name; and employee contact references comprising at least email address and level of security authorization; comparing queries using a weight matrix generated by a distance function; clustering of the queries into a semantic structure based on said weight matrix, by grouping said queries into a 'prioritized structure' based on the comparison of a location of a word in said query to the location of the same word in another query; and rating of a new query relative to the nearest of said clusters, wherein said new queries ~~can be~~ are evaluated in one of real-time and periodically, to determine whether to one of: add said query to an existing cluster; and form a separate "satellite" cluster.

Claim 2. (Currently Amended) The method according to claim 1, further comprising: periodically updating the gathering of data of said newly submitted queries and resulting documents into a sum total of data elements for the organization; entering said sum total in the organization DB without prior categorization of ~~it~~ said sum total by subject matter; instantly performing a matching procedure of assembling queries and documents keywords into clusters; categorizing said newly submitted queries according to a continuously updated list of categories; and repeatedly redefining categories and clusters according to new queries and documents.

Claim 3. (Original) The method according to claim 2, comprising the steps of: gathering data into the organization DB; generating a vector structure of the data; and using the vector structure in order to form semantic familiarities (clustering words, i.e., "connections").

Claim 4. (Currently Amended) The method according to claim 2, further comprising enhancing the queries for later pre-processing of the data, in order to best exploit the latter element of the method.

Claim 5. (Currently Amended) The method according to claim 4, wherein enhancing comprises: enhancing words appearing in queries by multiplying the number of appearances with a constant; comparing the distribution of a word within the organization DB and its distribution of said word in Common Language (CL); and weighting words appearances in the DB and the queries relative to appearances in the (CL).

Claim 6. (Original) The method according to claim 4, further comprising clustering the data.

Claim 7. (Original) The method according to claim 6, wherein clustering the data comprises: using information theories in order to assemble and represent the data; using queries as prior knowledge for the algorithms processing the data; clustering data (agglomerative, sequential clustering); and using queries as a predisposed factor, thereby replacing the random factor when performing clustering.

Claim 8. (original) The method according to claim 6, further comprising using queries' data for searching information (implementing a search engine).

Claim 9. (Original) The method according to claim 8, comprising the steps of: searching information using the queries' structure (clusters); presenting queries' structure with respect to a new query (when a user presents a new query, the system rates the nearest clusters according to the new query); and presenting submitted queries in order to facilitate the submission of a new query.

Claim 10. (Original) The method according to claim 8, further comprising using the queries structure to create an organization map.

Claim 11. (Original) The method according to claim 11, wherein using the queries structure to create an organization map comprises: developing a method that facilitates the designation of experts concerning the requested data; and providing a graphical organization map of the data occurrences and the experts.

ALLOWANCE

6.   Claims 1-11 are allowed over the prior art made of record.

REASON FOR ALLOWANCE

7.   The followings are an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

8.   The prior art of record, Szabo (US Patent No. 7,181,438 B1) describing an interface

system which define a taxonomic context for the operation, a business negotiation, or other

activity through a database search. The result of this search would provide the user with a

scoring and ranking that applied to the user defined criteria and also the user profile would be

stored in a computer and would be used to provide a history of use, persistent customization,

collaborative filtering and demographic information for the user (Abstract). Szabo specifically

refers to categorizing as a necessity for limiting search results when users wish to specify a

selected subject within a larger group of subjects as received from publishers. Szabo discloses

that adding a subject to the database should be conducted after and separately from, the earlier

procedure of categorizing it into limited subject matters (Col. 9 lines 12-16). Everett (US

2004/0024790 A1) describing the term bottlenecks a hardware standard bottleneck in

performance resulting from a work overload because of many tasks being performed by an

operating system at the time with limited capacity(Abstract) . Therefore combination of Szabo

and Everett does not teach the "*clustering of the queries into a semantic structure comparing*

queries using a weight matrix generated by a distance function; and clustering of the queries

into a semantic structure based on said weight matrix, by grouping said queries into a

'prioritized structure' based on the comparison of a location of a word in said query to the

location of the same word in another query".   However, after careful consideration of the

amended claims filed on January 8, 2008, the applicant exclusively and specifically pointed out

how the claim overcome the prior art of the record, particularly in combination of Szabo and

Everett the clustering of the queries into a semantic structure comparing queries using a weight

matrix generated by a distance function; and clustering of the queries into a semantic structure

based on said weight matrix.

9.   This allowable feature is indicated in independent claim 1 " *clustering of the queries into*

a semantic structure comparing queries using a weight matrix generated by a distance function;

and clustering of the queries into a semantic structure based on said weight matrix, by grouping

said queries into a 'prioritized structure' based on the comparison of a location of a word in said

query to the location of the same word in another query", as recited in independent claim 1 in

combination with the remaining elements as cited in claim1. The prior art made of record, do not

disclose, teach, or suggest (in combination with all other features in the claim), the claimed

limitations of claim 1 as a whole.   Consequently, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-

11 are allowable over prior art.

CONCLUSION

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Fariborz Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is 571-270-1005.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH every other F 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fariborz Khoshnoodi/
Examiner
Art Unit 2164

/T. M./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2165

/Charles Rones/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164